

Remarks

The Office Action dated May 20, 2005 and made final has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 10-11, 13-15, 17-20 and 22 are now pending in this application, of which claims 1, 10 and 18 have been amended. Claims 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 16 and 21 are cancelled. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

Regarding the election requirement, the Examiner's comments are noted, and claims 3, 8, 9 and 12 are herein cancelled as they are directed to a non-elected invention.

The rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5, 10-11, 13-14, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,232,380) in view of Pelozo (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,998) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of former claim 6, now cancelled, which was indicated in the Final Office Action as reciting allowable subject matter. Claim 1 is therefore submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 5, and 7, when considered in combination with the recitations of claim 1, are likewise submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Claim 10 has been amended to include the recitations of former claim 16, now cancelled, which was indicated in the Final Office Action as reciting allowable subject matter. Claim 10 is therefore submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 11, 13 and 14, when considered in combination with the recitations of claim 10, are likewise submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Claim 18 has been amended to include the recitations of former claim 21, now cancelled, which was indicated in the Final Office Action as reciting allowable subject matter. Claim 18 is therefore submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Dependent claims 19 and 20, when considered in combination with the recitations of claim 18, are likewise submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, 10-11, 13-14, and 18-20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Inoue et al. in view of Pelloza and further in view of Aoyama et al. is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 depends from claim 10, which is submitted to be patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth above. When the recitations of claim 17 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 10, claim 17 is likewise submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 6-7, 15-16, and 21-22.

Claims 6, 16 and 21 are cancelled.

It is respectfully submitted that the respective base claims (claims 1, 10 and 18) for claims 7, 15 and 22, respectively, are patentable over the cited art. When the recitations of claims 7, 15 and 22 are considered in combination with the recitations of their base claims, claims 7, 15 and 22 are likewise submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to claims 6-7, 15-16, and 21-22 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce T. Atkins, Reg. No. 43,476
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square
Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102-2740
314-621-5070